

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/612,048	CHOI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Trinh Vo Dinh	2821	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Trinh Vo Dinh (Examiner). (3) _____.

(2) Richard T. Schachner (Attorney). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 03 November 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,8,15 and 22.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Per the telephone conversation, the Examiner clarified an amendment filed 10/04/04 was crossed in mail when the final rejection was being sent. In addition, the Examiner pointed out the formulas defined in claims 1, 8, 15 and 22 suffered formatting problems because the formulas did not look like the ones presented in the previous amendment filed 07/30/2004.

Applicant's representative agreed to submit an amendment to correct the formatting problems in order to place the application in a condition for allowance.